

Appl. No. 10/862,073
Amdt. dated October 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 30 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for her attention to this application. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, a replacement paragraph and more specific support for claim amendments are presented, as required by the Examiner. In particular, the replacement paragraph of page 3 line 21 has been properly identified, and support for the amendments to claim 1, and similar amendments, have been provided.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing submissions and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By way of the Office Action mailed August 30, 2006, the Examiner required corrections to the specification because there are two amended paragraphs proposed to page 3, line 4 of the Response dated June 16, 2006 which are not the same, and the second paragraph does not show the required markings as such. Both paragraphs are provided above. Applicants have amended the second paragraph to indicate that it begins on page 3 line 21 (rather than page 3 line 4) and note that the amendment to this paragraph indicates a replacement of the word "materials" with the word "material." Applicants believe that this paragraph is now in proper form and respectfully request consideration by the Examiner to accept the amendment.

By way of the Office Action mailed August 30, 2006, the Examiner notes that Applicants have set forth broadly sections of the originally filed application as support for the text added to the claims as found in the amendments to the claims proposed in the Response dated June 16, 2006. The Examiner requests that Applicants set forth more specifically where the support for the amendments can be found, particularly for claim 1 and claim 4.

More specific support for the amendments to the claims can be found as follows. In claim 1, support for the proposed amendment "...wherein the superabsorbent material has a degree of

Appl. No. 10/662,073
Amdt. dated October 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2006

neutralization of about 70%... can be found in the original disclosure on page 11 lines 19-20, page 12 lines 5-6, page 12 lines 28-29, page 13 lines 14-15, page 14 lines 4-5, page 14 lines 29-30, page 15 lines 15-16 and page 16 lines 4-5. In claim 1, support for the proposed amendment *"...and from about 30 mole % to about 65 mole % of the acrylic acid is neutralized with a monovalent metal hydroxide..."* can be found in the original disclosure on page 11 lines 19-20, page 12 lines 5-6, page 12 lines 28-29, page 13 lines 14-15, page 14 lines 4-5, page 14 lines 29-30, page 15 lines 15-16 and page 16 lines 4-5 (Applicants note that sodium hydroxide is an example of a monovalent metal hydroxide). In claim 1, support for the proposed amendment *"...and from about 5 mole % to about 40 mole % of the acrylic acid is neutralized with a divalent metal hydroxide..."* can be found in the original disclosure on page 11 line 20, page 12 line 6, page 12 line 29, page 13 line 15, page 14 line 5, page 14 line 30, page 15 line 16 and page 16 line 5 (Applicants note that both calcium hydroxide and magnesium hydroxide are examples of divalent metal hydroxide). In claim 1, support for the proposed amendment *"...at a temperature of about 40 °C..."* can be found in the original disclosure on page 11 line 21, page 12 line 7, page 12 line 30, page 13 line 16, page 14 line 6, page 14 line 31, page 15 line 17 and page 16 line 6. In claim 1, support for the proposed amendment *"...the absorbent composite exhibits a Drop Penetration Value of about 2 seconds or less as measured by the Saline Drop Penetration Test ..."* can be found in the original disclosure on page 24 lines 3-5.

Claim 4 has not been amended.

Support for the amendments to claim 12 and claim 23 as proposed in the Response dated June 16, 2006 are the same as that of claim 1.

Applicants believe that more particular support for the amended claims has now been provided, and Applicants respectfully request acceptance of the amendments as proposed in the Response dated June 16, 2006.

The amendments requiring correction have been presented in this response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment. All other amendments remain as presented in the response dated June 16, 2006.

Appl. No. 10/662,073
Amdt. dated October 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 30 2006

For the reasons stated above, it is sincerely believed that all of the presently presented claims are in form for allowance. Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed in this response, Applicants' undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

A Petition for One-Month Extension of Time is attached to this response. Please charge any prosecutorial fees which are due to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875.

The undersigned may be reached at: (920) 721-4405.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD N. DODGE II ET AL.

By



Bryan R. Rosiejka

Registration No.: 55, 583

Attorney for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I, Lanette Burton, hereby certify that on October 30, 2006, this document is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Lanette Burton

Signature:

